THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Date of Notice: August 7, 2006
PUBLIC NOTICE OF A
DRAFT Mitigated Negative Declaration
JO: 42-2406

The City of San Diego Land Development Review Division has prepared a draft Mitigated Negative Declaration for the following project and is inviting your comments regarding the adequacy of the document. Your comments must be received by August 28, 2006 to be included in the final document considered by the decision-making authorities. Please send your written comments to the following address: Marc Cass, Environmental Planner, City of San Diego Development Services Center, 1222 First Avenue, MS 501, San Diego, CA 92101 or e-mail your comments to MCass@Sandiego.gov with the Project Number in the subject line.

General Project Information:

• Project No. 27632, SCH No. N/A

Community Plan Area: La Jolla Community Planning Area

• Council District: Council District 1

Subject:

<u>Douglas Residence:</u> COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (CDP) and a SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (SDP) to allow the demolition of a single-family residence and the construction of a three-level single-family residence located at 7420 Vista Del Mar in the RS-1-7 zone of the La Jolla Community Planning Area. The site is located within the Sensitive Coastal Overlay Zone, the Coastal Height Limitation Overlay Zone, the Coastal Overlay Zone (appealable), the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) and the Parking Impact Overlay Zone (Legal Description: Portion of Pueblo Lot 1260 and a portion of Block 1 of La Jolla Park). Applicant: Clifford Douglas. The site is not included on any Government Code Listing of hazardous waste sites.

Applicant: Clifford Douglas.

Recommended Finding: The recommended finding that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment is based on an Initial Study and project revisions/conditions which now mitigate potentially significant environmental impacts in the following area(s): **MHPA Land Use Adjacency.**

Availability in Alternative Format: To request this Notice, the Mitigated Negative Declaration, Initial Study, and/or supporting documents in alternative format, call the Development Services Department at 619-446-5460 or (800) 735-2929 (TEXT TELEPHONE).

Additional Information: For environmental review information, contact Marc Cass at (619) 446-5330. The draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, Initial Study, and supporting documents may be reviewed, or purchased for the cost of reproduction, at the Fifth floor of the Development Services Center. For information regarding public meetings/hearings on this project, contact Project Manager Glenn Gargas at (619) 446-5142. This notice was published in the SAN DIEGO DAILY TRANSCRIPT, placed on the City of San Diego web-site (http://clerkdoc.sannet.gov/Website/publicnotice/pubnotceqa.html), and distributed on August 4, 2006.

Robert J. Manis, Assistant Deputy Director Development Services Department



Land Development Review Division (619) 446-5460

Mitigated Negative Declaration

Project No. 27632

SUBJECT: Douglas Residence: COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (CDP) and a SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (SDP) to allow the demolition of a single-family residence and the construction of a three-level single-family residence located at 7420 Vista Del Mar in the RS-1-7 zone of the La Jolla Community Planning Area. The site is located within the Sensitive Coastal Overlay Zone, the Coastal Height Limitation Overlay Zone, the Coastal Overlay Zone (appealable), the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) and the Parking Impact Overlay Zone (A portion of Pueblo Lot 1260 and a portion of Block 1 of La Jolla Park) Applicant: Clifford Douglas.

- I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: See attached Initial Study.
- \coprod . ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING: See attached Initial Study.

Ш. DETERMINATION:

The City of San Diego conducted an Initial Study which determined that the proposed project could have a significant environmental effect in the following areas(s): MHPA Land Use Adjacency. Subsequent revisions in the project proposal create the specific mitigation identified in Section V of this Mitigated Negative Declaration. The project as revised now avoids or mitigates the potentially significant environmental effects previously identified, and the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report will not be required.

IV. DOCUMENTATION:

The attached Initial Study documents the reasons to support the above Determination.

V.

Α. General

MMRP Conditions - The applicant shall comply with the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) as specified in the Mitigated Negative Declaration satisfactory to the City Manager and the City Engineer. Prior to issuance of any construction permit(s) or filing of final map(s), all mitigation measures as specifically outlined in the MMRP shall be implemented for the following issue areas: MHPA Land Use Adjacency.

В. MHPA Land Use Adjacency

1. Prior to the issuance of the building permit, the applicant shall provide construction drawings which indicate that all exterior lighting adjacent to the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) will be directed downward/away from the MHPA, and shielded if necessary, satisfactory to the Assistant Deputy Director of the Environmental Analysis Section.

2. Prior to the issuance of the grading and/or building permit, the applicant shall provide drawings which indicate that drainage will be directed away from the MHPA, satisfactory to the Assistant Deputy Director of the Environmental Analysis Section.

VI. PUBLIC REVIEW DISTRIBUTION:

Draft copies or notice of this Mitigated Negative Declaration were distributed to:

City of San Diego

Development Services Department Council District 1 Glenn Gargas, Development Project Manager LDR Planning Review, Darren Genova MSCP (MS 5A) Planning- Long Range Planning, Sarah Osborn

Other

La Jolla Shores Association (272)
La Jolla Town Council (273)
Pat Dahlberg (274)
La Jolla Community Planning Association (275)
Milton Phegley (277)
La Jolla Shores PDO Advisory Board (279)
La Jolla Light (280)
La Jollans for Responsible Planning (282)
Patricia Miller (283)
Sarah Horton
Clifford Douglas

VII. RESULTS OF PUBLIC REVIEW:

() No comments were received during the public input period.

- Comments were received but did not address the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration finding or the accuracy/completeness of the Initial Study. No response is necessary. The letters are attached.
- () Comments addressing the findings of the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration and/or accuracy or completeness of the Initial Study were received during the public input period. The letters and responses follow.

Copies of the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program and any Initial Study material are available in the office of the Land Development Review Division for review, or for purchase at the cost of reproduction.

Allison Sherwood, Senior Planher Development Services Department August 7, 2006 Date of Draft Report

Date of Final Report

Analyst: Cass

City of San Diego **Development Services Department** LAND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW DIVISION 1222 First Avenue, Mail Station 501 San Diego, CA 92101 (619) 446-5460

> **INITIAL STUDY** Project No. 27632

SUBJECT: Douglas Residence: COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (CDP) and a SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (SDP) to allow the demolition of a single-family residence and the construction of a three-level single-family residence located at 7420 Vista Del Mar in the RS-1-7 zone of the La Jolla Community Planning Area. The site is located within the Sensitive Coastal Overlay Zone, the Coastal Height Limitation Overlay Zone, the Coastal Overlay Zone (appealable), the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) and the Parking Impact Overlay Zone (Legal Description: Portion of Pueblo Lot 1260 and a portion of Block 1 of La Jolla Park). Applicant: Clifford Douglas.

PURPOSE AND MAIN FEATURES: I.

The proposed project is a Coastal Development Permit and a Site Development Permit, to be considered by the Hearing Officer (Process 3), which would allow the demolition of a two-level single-family residence and the construction of a 4,870 square-foot, three-level, single-family residence over a basement on a 7,589.7 square-foot lot. The proposed single-family residence would include 4 bedrooms, 4 bathrooms, a game area, dining room, kitchen and office. An elevator would provide access from the basement to the other three levels.

The site would continue to be accessed from Vista Del Mar. Parking would consist of a three-car garage at ground-level. Grading tabulations would consist of 800 cubic-yards of cut at depths down to 12 feet. Site drainage would be directed to the southwest side of the structure and would be treated by appropriate Best Management Practice's (BMPs).

Exterior treatments would include a cream colored stucco and vertical lined concrete on the north, south and east sides of the proposed structure. The west side of the structure has three balconies and would be mainly comprised of windows. Landscaping would be in conformance with the City's Landscape Technical Manual and would consist of some of the following trees: Aloe Dichotoma, Bauhinia Blakeana; Evergreen shrubs such as Cycas Revoluta, Dioon Eudule; medium and small shrubs, flowering groundcover and vines. The subject property is located within the Coastal Height Limitation Overlay Zone and would comply with the 30-foot height limit at the proposed height of 29.9'.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING: II.

The previously developed 0.17-acre site is located at 7420 Vista Del Mar in the La Jolla Community Planning Area. The site is a beachfront property that abuts public beach access to the north. The La Jolla Community Plan designates the site as Low Density Residential (5-8 dwelling units/acre). Surrounding land uses include residential on the north, south and east sides of the site. The site and surrounding sites are zoned RS-1-7 (Residential-Single Unit; requires a minimum 5,000 square-foot lot).

The site is developed with a two-story, single family residence. No biological resources exist on-site. A portion of southwestern corner of the property (less than 5 square-feet) is within the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA). The elevation of the site is relatively flat with an Average Mean Sea Level (AMSL) of 30 feet near the northwest corner to a low of approximately 14 feet AMSL along the west side property line. The site is located within an urbanized area and would be adequately served by police and fire services.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS: See attached Initial Study checklist.

IV. DISCUSSION:

During the environmental review of the project, it was determined that construction could result in significant but mitigable impacts in the following area(s): MHPA (Land Use Adjacency).

MHPA (Land Use Adjacency)

The southwestern portion of the subject property is partially within (approximately five square-feet), and adjacent to, the MHPA. Section 1.4.3 of the MSCP Subarea Plan requires that projects located adjacent to the MHPA be designed to reduce indirect impacts to the MHPA to below a level of significance. The project would need to implement design measures to ensure indirect impacts from lighting and drainage would not occur. Therefore, a Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program, as detailed in Section V of the MND, would be implemented which would require project compliance with the Land Use/MHPA Adjacency Guidelines. With the implementation of Land Use/MHPA Adjacency Guideline compliant site design, indirect impacts to the MHPA would be reduced to below a level of significance.

The following environmental issues were considered in depth during the environmental review of the project and determined NOT to be potentially significant: Geology, Water Quality/Hydrology, Biology, Air Quality and Visual Quality.

Geology:

The project site is located in a seismically active region of California, and therefore, the potential exists for geologic hazards, such as earthquakes and ground failure. However, no faults have been mapped on site (City of San Diego 1974). Because the site is currently developed and seismic considerations were required in the existing building design, the impacts to the proposed structures would likely be minimal.

However, in order to adequately assess potential geologic conditions, Geotechnical Investigation with subsequent addendums and a Wave Runup Study were prepared for the proposed project and are summarized herein. The reports indicate that the vegetation on the site consists primarily of landscaped groundcover on the western portion of the lot and ornamental shrubs. The western portion of the site is protected from extreme wave run-up by a quarry stone revetment approximately 26 years old. The revetment is expected to adequately protect the property for the next 75 years. The eastern portion of the property consists of a relatively level, short, rectangular driveway and garage building pad adjacent to Vista Del Mar.

Soil descriptions were ascertained through the use of exploratory excavations, which were taken at the site. The excavations revealed shallow artificial fill (Qaf) overlaying slopewash/topsoil (Qsw) materials over natural terrace materials (Qt). Groundwater was encountered during two of the exploratory borings. Groundwater is also anticipated to be encountered during construction; however, dewatering would be required if groundwater is encountered.

Proper engineering design of the proposed structures would be verified prior to building permits being issued. This would ensure that the potential for geologic impacts from regional hazards would be below a level of significance.

Biology

In order to assess any potential impacts to any biological resources or sensitive species that may be present on the subject property, a biological survey was prepared for the project. The survey, titled "Biological Survey of Residential Lot Located at 7420 Vista Del Mar Avenue" and dated May 31, 2005, was prepared to verify the composition of plant and animal species on the site.

The survey concluded that no sensitive special of plants or animals were observed on the site and no significant populations of any species known from the region are expected. As such, the project would not result in significant impacts to any biological resources or species.

Water Quality/Hydrology:

In order to assess the potential impacts to water quality from the proposed project, a Water Quality Technical Report (April 7, 2006) was prepared for the project. The report is summarized below.

The Water Quality Technical Report indicates that the site drainage would be directed to the southwest side of the structure and would be treated by appropriate Best Management Practice's (BMPs). The report further indicates that the proposed construction is anticipated to have pollutants that might impair the storm water quality. The following anticipated pollutants were identified: Sediments, Nutrients, Trash and Debris, oxygen demanding substances, oil and grease, bacteria, viruses and pesticides.

To address these expected pollutants, Construction Storm Water BMPs in the form of practices, procedures, devices/materials would be implemented. In addition, Permanent Storm Water BMPs in the form of site design, source control features, and treatment control BMPs would become part of the project's permanent design and remain functioning throughout the use of the project site.

The project would be conditioned to implement Construction Storm Water BMPs and Permanent Storm Water BMPs. Compliance with the required BMP's would be made conditions of the permit, and would preclude significant impacts to water quality.

Air Quality:

The project is proposing to demolish eight multi-family and single-family units which may contain asbestos and lead-based paint and if so, could potentially pose a risk to human health and public safety. While the City of San Diego does not have permitting authority over the handling of hazardous material, all demolition activities must be conducted in accordance with the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District

(SDAPCD) Rules 361.140 through 361.156 and the California Code of Regulations Title 8 and 17 regarding the handling and disposal of Asbestos-containing materials and Leadbased paints, respectively.

The SDAPCD requires that a project follow special procedures during demolition, renovation, and removal of asbestos containing material. In addition, the SDAPCD must be notified in writing at least 10 days in advance of any demolition regardless of whether any asbestos is present or not. Failure to meet these requirements would result in the issuance of a Notice of Violation.

If the testing shows the presence of asbestos or lead-based paints, then proper precautions must be made during the removal and disposal of asbestos or lead-based paint containing materials. The removal and disposal of these materials is regulated by state agencies (Cal-OSHA and Cal-EPA), the SDAPCD, and the County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health (DEH). These agencies ensure that the demolition crew, adjacent residents, or other individuals are not exposed to these hazardous building materials.

Because the above-mentioned State and County agencies oversee asbestos and lead-based paint removal, and it is required of the applicant to notify these agencies prior to any demolition activities as per state and county law, human health and public safety impacts due to the demolition of the on-site structures would be below a level of significance. Notice to the SDAPCD would be a permit condition; therefore, permit issuance would preclude a significant impact to air quality.

Visual Quality

The La Jolla Community Plan identifies a public view corridor directly to the north of the subject property. In order to assess whether the proposed project would result in potential view impacts, a photo survey was prepared. The survey documents the existing conditions of the site in relation to the designated view corridor. The threshold used to determine potential impacts to public views is whether the project would exceed development regulations and as a result, substantially block a view corridor. The proposed project would be in compliance with the requirements of the underlying zone (e.g. height, setbacks) and would not encroach into the view corridor. As such, the project would not result in a significant impact to designated views.

V.RECOMMENDATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- The proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION should be prepared.
- _X_ Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described in Section IV above have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION should be prepared.
- The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVÎRÔNMÊNTAL ÎMPACT REPORT should be required.

PROJECT ANALYST: Cass

Attachments:

Figure 1: Location Map Figure 2: Site Plan

Figure 3: Site Sections

Figure 4: Elevations

Initial Study Checklist



Douglas Residence



Location Map

Environmental Analysis Section Project No. 27632 CITY OF SAN DIEGO · DEVELOPMENT SERVICES Figure

1



Site Plan
Environmental Analysis Section - Project No. 27632
CITY OF SAN DIEGO - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Figure



Site Sections

Environmental Analysis Section - Project No. 27632 CITY OF SAN DIEGO · DEVELOPMENT SERVICES 310 F.F.



Exterior Elevations
Environmental Analysis Section - Project No. 27632
CITY OF SAN DIEGO · DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Initial Study Checklist

6/5/2006

Date:

			Project No.:		2/632	
			Name of Project:	Douglas	s Residence	
III. EN	VII	RONMENTAL ANALYSIS:				
which of Guideli the bass or Miti environ project potentia	ines is for gate ime ime al f	se of the Initial Study is to identify ld be associated with a project pure so. In addition, the Initial Study proper deciding whether to prepare an led Negative Declaration. This Chemital assessment. However, subsequy mitigate adverse impacts. All aror significant environmental impactnitial Study.	suant to Section 15063 vides the lead agency we Environmental Impact I becklist provides a mean quent to this preliminary and "mean"	of the Stavith infor Report, Nos to facility review, aybe" ind	ate CEQA mation wh legative De tate early modificati licate that t	ich forms eclaration ons to the here is a
				Yes	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
I.	ΑE	STHETICS / NEIGHBORHOOD	CHARACTER – Will	the propo	sal result i	n:
	A.	The obstruction of any vista or so a public viewing area? No such view, as indicated in the Community Plan would be impact the project would be not exceed 3 highest point. See Visual Quality Study.	La Jolla ted. Additionally, 0' at it's		_√	
	B.	The creation of a negative aesthet project? The project would be in complian underlying zone. No negative aesthet project would result from project implementation.	ce with the		_	<u> 1</u>

		<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
C.	Project bulk, scale, materials, or style which would be incompatible with surrounding development? The proposed residential project would be consistent with the surrounding development in terms of bulk, scale, materials, and style.	_	_	
D.	Substantial alteration to the existing character of the area? The proposed single-family development would be in conformance with the existing character of the area.	_	_	<u>√</u>
E.	The loss of any distinctive or landmark tree(s), or a stand of mature trees? There are no distinctive or landmark tree(s), or a stand of mature trees on the site.			
F.	Substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features? The project proposes cut and export of 800 cubic-yards. The project site does not contain steep slopes where a substantial change in topography or ground surface would occur.	_		<u> </u>
G.	The loss, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features such as a natural canyon, sandstone bluff, rock outcrop, or hillside with a slope in excess of 25 percent? No such loss, covering, or modification of any of the above mentioned geologic or physical features would occur.	_	_	<u> </u>
Η.	Substantial light or glare? The project would not produce a substantial amount of light or glare.	_	_	_√_
I.	Substantial shading of other properties? The project would not exceed 30 feet at it's highest point.			

II.	AGRICULTURE RESOURCES / NATURAL RESOURCE RESOURCES – Would the proposal result in:	ES / MINE	RAL	
	A. The loss of availability of a known mineral resource (e.g., sand or gravel) that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? The project site is on urban land that has been heavily disturbed and has supported previous development. No known mineral resources are present.	_	_	_\
	B. The conversion of agricultural land to nonagricultural use or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land? The project site is located within a developed, urbanized area.	_	_	<u>\lambda</u>
III.	AIR QUALITY – Would the proposal:			
	A. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? The project is expected to generate minimal amount of Particulate Matter through grading and demolition. See Initial Study Discussion under Air Quality.	_		
	 B. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? See III-A. 	_	_	
	C. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? <u>See III-A.</u>			
	D. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?See III-A.	_		<u>√</u>
	E. Exceed 100 pounds per day of Particulate Matter 10 (dust)? The project would cut 800 cubic-yards. As such, the project would not exceed 100 pounds per day.			<u> </u>

		<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
	F. Alter air movement in the area of the project? The existing single-family residence would be replaced with a single-family residence. Air movement is not expected to change.		_	<u> </u>
	G. Cause a substantial alteration in moisture, or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally? See III-A.	_		
IV.	BIOLOGY – Would the proposal result in:			
	A. A reduction in the number of any unique, rare, endangered, sensitive, or fully protected species of plants or animals? There are no such species of plants or animals on or adjacent to the project site. See Biology Discussion in Initial Study.		√	
	B. A substantial change in the diversity of any species of animals or plants? See IV-A.	_		
	C. Introduction of invasive species of plants into the area? Proposed project landscaping would conform to the City of San Diego's approved plant species and invasive species would not be introduced into the area.	—	_	
	D. Interference with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors? No such corridors exist on or adjacent to the project site.	_		_√_
	E. An impact to a sensitive habitat, including, but not limited to streamside vegetation, aquatic, riparian, oak woodland, coastal sage scrub or chaparral? See IV-A.			

		<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
F.	An impact on City, State, or federally regulated wetlands (including, but not limited to, coastal salt marsh, vernal pool, lagoon, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means? There are no wetlands on-site.			√
	G. Conflict with the provisions of the City's Multiple Species Conservation Program Subarea Plan or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan? The project is adjacent to the MHPA. As such, the Land Use Adjacency Guidelines would be implemented. See the adjacency guidelines	_		
V.	mitigation in section V of the attached MND. ENERGY – Would the proposal:			
	A. Result in the use of excessive amounts of fuel or energy (e.g. natural gas)? The proposed single-family residential development would not use excessive amounts of fuel or energy.		_	
	B. Result in the use of excessive amounts of power?See V-A.			1
VI.	GEOLOGY/SOILS – Would the proposal: A. Expose people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards? The proposed project lies within Geologic Hazard Categories 44 and 53. Additionally, Geotechnical reports were submitted to and approved by BDR-Geology. See Initial Study Discussion.	_	_√_	
	B. Result in a substantial increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site? All runoff would be collected in a private storm drain			

	arratana and haddinaatad ta tha arrathuraatana mantian	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
	system and be directed to the southwestern portion of the property to be treated by appropriate BMPs.			
	C. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in onor off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? See VI-A.	_		
VII.	HISTORICAL RESOURCES – Would the proposal result in:			
	A. Alteration of or the destruction of a prehistoric or historic archaeological site? The project site is currently developed. Development of the proposed single-family residence would not result in impacts to archaeological sites.			
	 B. Adverse physical or aesthetic effects to a prehistoric or historic building, structure, object, or site? The existing single-family residence is older than 45 years. However, demolition of the structure would not result in an adverse impact to a potential historic structure. 			_√_
	 C. Adverse physical or aesthetic effects to an architecturally significant building, structure, or object? See VII-B. 			
	 D. Any impact to existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? No such potential exists on-site. See VII-A. 			
	E. The disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? See VII-A.			
VIII.	HUMAN HEALTH / PUBLIC SAFETY / HAZARDOUS MA	TERI <i>A</i>	ALS: Would	d the

proposal:

A. Create any known health hazard

	(excluding mental health)? The project is a proposed single-family residential development and does not include the use or handling of hazardous materials. Therefore, no health hazards are expected to result from project implementation.	Yes —	Maybe 	No V
B.	Expose people or the environment to a significant hazard through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials? See VIII-A	_		
C.	Create a future risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances (including but not limited to gas, oil, pesticides, chemicals, radiation, or explosives)? See VIII-A.	_		_√
D.	Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? No such impairment is anticipated.		_	_1/_
E.	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or environment? The site is not listed on the County's DEH SAM case listing.	_	_	_√_
F.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? See VIII-A.			<u> </u>

IX.	HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY – Would the propose	al result in:		
	A. An increase in pollutant discharges, including down stream sedimentation, to receiving waters during or following construction? Consider water quality parameters such as temperature dissolved oxygen, turbidity and other typical storm water pollutants. Best Management Practices would be implemented. Please see the Water Quality discussion in the Initial Study.			
	B. An increase in impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff? The development footprint of the proposed single-family residence would essentially be the same as the existing structure.	_		
	 C. Substantial alteration to on- and off-site drainage patterns due to changes in runoff flow rates or volumes? No such impacts would occur. 	_		
	D. Discharge of identified pollutants to an already impaired water body (as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list)? Appropriate Best Management Practice's (BMP's) would be incorporated into the project. See Water Quality discussion in the Initial Study.			
	E. A potentially significant adverse impact on ground water quality?See IX-A. and -D.	_	_	
	F. Cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses? See IX-A. and -B.	_	_	1

			<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
X.	LA	AND USE – Would the proposal result in:			
	A.	A land use which is inconsistent with the adopted community plan land use designation for the site or conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over a project? The La Jolla Community Plan designates the site as Low Density Residential (5-8 dwelling units/acre). Therefore, the proposed residential development is consistent with the La Jolla Community Plan.		<u>\</u>	
	B.	A conflict with the goals, objectives and recommendations of the community plan in which it is located? The project would be consistent with the La Jolla Community Plan.	_		_1_
	C.	A conflict with adopted environmental plans, including applicable habitat conservation plans adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect for the area? The project does not conflict with any such plans.			
	D.	Physically divide an established community? The project would not divide an established community.			
	E.	Land uses which are not compatible with aircraft accident potential as defined by an adopted airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan? The project is not located within the Airport Environs Overlay Zone nor the Airport Approach Overlay Zone.	_	_	

XI.	NOISE – Would the proposal result in:	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
	A. A significant increase in the existing ambient noise levels? The project is a residential development and would not result in the generation of noise, except during construction. Noise from construction is temporary and is regulated by the City of San Diego Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance, Section 59.5.0404 of the San Diego Municipal Code.			
	B. Exposure of people to noise levels which exceed the City's adopted noise ordinance? The proposed single-family development would not be located close to any major roadway and traffic from residential streets would be minimal. Therefore, noise impacts would not exceed standards set forth within the noise ordinance.		_	
	C. Exposure of people to current or future transportation noise levels which exceed standards established in the Transportation Element of the General Plan or an adopted airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan? See XI B.	_		
XII.	PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the proposal impact a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? The project proposes grading in the Bay Point and Point Loma Formations, both of which have high fossil potential. However, due to the amount of cut proposed (800 cubic-yards), the project would not impact paleontological resources.	_		

Yes Maybe N	lo
-------------	----

XIII.	POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the proposal:			
	A. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? The project would not induce substantial population growth through business or housing development.			_\
	B. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? The project proposes the demolition of single-family residence and the construction of a single-family residence. No substantial housing displacement would occur.			<u>\</u>
	C. Alter the planned location, distribution, density or growth rate of the population of an area? See XIII-A and -B.			_√_
XIV.	PUBLIC SERVICES —Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any the public services::			
	A. Fire protection? <u>Proposed project would be developed in an urbanized area and is not anticipated to have a significant affect on fire protection. Fire</u>	_	_	1

		Protection would be available to the new development.	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
	В.	Police protection? <u>Police protection would be available to the new development.</u> See XIV-A.		_	
	C.	Schools? The project would not have a significant impact on schools.	_		
	D.	Parks or other recreational facilities? No effect would occur.			
	E.	Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? Maintenance of public facilities would not be affected with the project being developed. See XIV-A.	_	_	
	F.	Other governmental services? No effect would occur. See XIV-A.			
XV.	RE	ECREATIONAL RESOURCES – Would the proposal resul	t in:		
	A.	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? The project would not have an affect on recreational resources.	_	_	<u>√</u>
	В.	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? No such adverse effects would occur. See X-V.	_	_	

XVI.	TF	RANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION – Would the proposal	Yes result in	Maybe n:	<u>No</u>
	A.	Traffic generation in excess of specific/community plan allocation? The project would not generate traffic in excess of the La Jolla Community plan.	_		
	B.	An increase in projected traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system? See XVI-A.			
	C.	An increased demand for off-site parking? No demand for off-site parking would occur.			<u> </u>
	D.	Effects on existing parking? <u>See XVI-B</u> .			
	E.	Substantial impact upon existing or planned transportation systems? The proposed project would not affect existing or planned transportation systems.			
	F.	Alterations to present circulation movements including effects on existing public access to beaches, parks, or other open space areas? Public access to any such areas would not be impacted.	_	_	<u>√</u>
	G.	Increase in traffic hazards for motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians due to a proposed, non-standard design feature (e.g., poor sight distance or driveway onto an access-restricted roadway)? The project would be designed to engineering standards. No such impacts would result.	_	_	<u> </u>
	H.	A conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation models (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? It is not anticipated that the project would create any conflicts with such adopted transportation policies, plans, or programs.	_	_	

Yes Maybe No XVII. UTILITIES – Would the proposal result in a need for new systems, or require substantial alterations to existing utilities, including: A. Natural gas? The proposed project would not require new systems or substantial alterations to existing natural gas utilities. B. Communications systems? No new systems or substantial alterations would be required. See XVII-A. C. Water? No new systems or substantial alterations would be required. See XVII-A. D. Sewer? No new systems or substantial alterations would be required. See XVII-A. E. Storm water drainage? No new systems or substantial alterations would be required. See XVII-A. F. Solid waste disposal? No new systems or substantial alterations would be required. See XVII-A. XVIII. WATER CONSERVATION – Would the proposal result in: A. Use of excessive amounts of water? Project would not use excessive amounts of

water.

B. Landscaping which is predominantly non-drought resistant vegetation?

Landscaping Regulations.

Landscaping would be consistent with the City's

Yes Maybe No MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE: A. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? No sensitive vegetation exists on-site. The project does not have the potential to affect any of the above. B. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time while long-term impacts would endure well into the Project is consistent with the long-term vision and would not achieve short-term goals to the disadvantage of long-term goals. C. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project may impact on two or more separate resources where the impact on each resource is relatively small, but where the effect of the total of those impacts on the environment is significant.) The project would not contribute to considerable cumulative impacts. D. Does the project have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? The proposed project would not cause substantial adverse environmental effects on

human beings, either directly or indirectly.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

REFERENCES

I.	Aesthetics / Neighborhood Character
	City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.
<u>√</u>	Community Plan.
	Local Coastal Plan.
II.	Agricultural Resources / Natural Resources / Mineral Resources
	City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.
	U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey - San Diego Area, California, Part I and II, 1973.
	California Department of Conservation - Division of Mines and Geology, Mineral Land Classification.
	Division of Mines and Geology, Special Report 153 - Significant Resources Maps.
	Site Specific Report:
III.	Air
	California Clean Air Act Guidelines (Indirect Source Control Programs) 1990.
	Regional Air Quality Strategies (RAQS) - APCD.
	Site Specific Report:
IV.	Biology
	City of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Subarea Plan, 1997
	City of San Diego, MSCP, "Vegetation Communities with Sensitive Species and Vernal Pools" maps, 1996.
V	City of San Diego, MSCP, "Multiple Habitat Planning Area" maps, 1997.

	Community Plan - Resource Element.
_	California Department of Fish and Game, California Natural Diversity Database, "State and Federally-listed Endangered, Threatened, and Rare Plants of California," January 2001.
	California Department of Fish & Game, California Natural Diversity Database, "State and Federally-listed Endangered and Threatened Animals of California," January 2001.
	City of San Diego Land Development Code Biology Guidelines.
	Site Specific Report: "Biological Survey of Residential Lot Located at 7420 Vista Del Mar Avenue, La Jolla California" dated May 31, 2005.
V.	Energy N/A
VI.	Geology/Soils
	City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study.
	U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Survey - San Diego Area, California, Part I and II, December 1973 and Part III, 1975.
	Site Specific Report: "Report of Geologic Reconnaissance" dated January 12, 2004.
	Site Specific Report: "Report of Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation" dated June 2005.
	Site Specific Report: "Supplemental Field Exploration re: Respons to City Review of Report of Geologic Reconnaissance and Report of Preliminary Geotechnical Investigion." dated October 28, 2005.
	Site Specific Report: "Response to City Review of Report of Geologic Reconnaissance and Report of Preliminary Geotechnical Investigion." dated September 29, 2005.
VII.	Historical Resources
_√	City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines.
	City of San Diego Archaeology Library.
	Historical Resources Board List.

	Community Historical Survey:
	Site Specific Report:
VIII.	Human Health / Public Safety / Hazardous Materials
	San Diego County Hazardous Materials Environmental Assessment Listing, 2004.
	San Diego County Hazardous Materials Management Division
	FAA Determination
	State Assessment and Mitigation, Unauthorized Release Listing, Public Use Authorized 1995.
	Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan.
	Site Specific Report:
IX.	Hydrology/Water Quality
	Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM).
	Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), National Flood Insurance Program - Flood Boundary and Floodway Map.
	Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, dated July, 2003, http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/303d_lists.html).
	Site Specific Report: "Water Quality Technical Report" prepared by Lamprides Environmental Organization and dated April 7, 2006
X.	Land Use
	City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.
	Community Plan.
	Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan
$\sqrt{}$	City of San Diego Zoning Maps

	FAA Determination
XI.	Noise
	Community Plan
	San Diego International Airport - Lindbergh Field CNEL Maps.
	Brown Field Airport Master Plan CNEL Maps.
	Montgomery Field CNEL Maps.
	San Diego Association of Governments - San Diego Regional Average Weekday Traffic Volumes.
	San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG.
	City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.
	Site Specific Report:
XII.	Paleontological Resources
<u> </u>	City of San Diego Paleontological Guidelines.
	Deméré, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh, "Paleontological Resources City of San Diego," <u>Department of Paleontology</u> San Diego Natural History Museum, 1996.
	Kennedy, Michael P., and Gary L. Peterson, "Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California. Del Mar, La Jolla, Point Loma, La Mesa, Poway, and SW 1/4 Escondido 7 1/2 Minute Quadrangles," <u>California Division of Mines and Geology Bulletin</u> 200, Sacramento, 1975.
	Kennedy, Michael P., and Siang S. Tan, "Geology of National City, Imperial Beach and
	Otay Mesa Quadrangles, Southern San Diego Metropolitan Area, California," Map Sheet 29, 1977.
-	
XIII.	29, 1977.

	Community Plan.
<u>_</u>	Series 8 Population Forecasts, SANDAG.
	Other:
XIV.	Public Services
	City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.
	Community Plan.
XV.	Recreational Resources
	City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.
	Community Plan.
	Department of Park and Recreation
	City of San Diego - San Diego Regional Bicycling Map
	Additional Resources:
XVI.	Transportation / Circulation
	City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.
	Community Plan.
	San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG
	San Diego Region Weekday Traffic Volumes, SANDAG.
	Site Specific Report:
XVII.	Utilities
	Community Plan
XVIII.	Water Conservation N/A
	Sunset Magazine, New Western Garden Book. Rev. ed. Menlo Park, CA: Sunset Magazine.